

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 16, 18, and 21-25 are pending in this application. Claim 18 has been allowed. Claim 16 has been withdrawn from consideration. The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors. No amendments to the claims are made herein.

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. This rejection appears to apply to Claim 25 rather than Claim 24. In Applicant's paper mailed January 10, 2003, Applicant inadvertently added two claim numbers 24. The second of the two should have been labeled Claim 25, as has been done in the listing of claims provided herein. The Examiner seems to have recognized Applicant's error, since the patentability of Claim 25 was addressed in the Office Action. In the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant will assume that the Examiner was referring to Claim 25 in this rejection.

The rejection contains two extended quotes, but the Examiner did not indicate from where he was quoting. Neither of the quotes is from Claims 21-25, although it appears that the Examiner was attempting to read limitations of Claim 25 into independent Claim 21, and made several changes to the claim language in the process of constructing the aggregated claim. Whatever the case may be, Claim 25 finds support in the specification on page 16, in the paragraph starting at line 15 and ending at line 28, as well as in the paragraph bridging pages 16 and 17 of the specification. Specifically, the former paragraph includes the following statement: "[t]he process is repeated on the second surface having a pattern of solder ball contact pads aligned to the preformed vias", and the latter paragraph (amended herein) includes the following statement: "[i]n similar manner, an embossing tool for the second side of the flex circuit includes raised

solder ball contact pads, interconnections to vias and vias coated with a thin film of copper." The limitation of Claim 25, "wherein said steps a), b) and c) are performed on two surfaces of said film", is thus supported in the specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 24 (Applicant assumes Claim 25 was intended) stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph requires that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. Claim 25 says that steps a), b) and c) of Claim 21 are performed on two surfaces of the film. The rejection is based on the Examiner's statement that it is unclear whether it is the same embossing tool or a different one that is used to perform step a) on the second of the two surfaces of the film. The Examiner further states that his concern is due to his observation that the same tool cannot be adjacent to two surfaces at the same time. Applicant respectfully points out that the standard required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is not clarity to or understanding by the Examiner, but is instead the requirement that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Claim 25 meets that standard by stating very simply that the cited steps of Claim 25 are performed on two surfaces of the film. Whether the steps are accomplished with one tool or two, or simultaneously or at different times has nothing to do with whether the claim particularly points out and distinctly claims Applicant's invention. Having met the relevant legal standard of 35 U.S.C. 112, Applicant is entitled to the maximum breadth of claim scope allowed by the disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 21-23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sumi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,979,044). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 21 includes the step of "positioning adjacent to said film an embossing tool." Sumi does not disclose the use of an embossing

· tool. Sumi discloses a method of fabricating a laminated board. Specifically, the copper-clad laminate layers 10 and 20 are laminated onto pre-preg layer 30. Layers 10 and 20 are not tools, but are rather a part of Sumi's finished product. Claim 21 also includes the step of "applying heat and pressure on said tool to simultaneously emboss the film and to transfer said thin metal layer from the embossing tool to the polymer film." Sumi does not disclose the transfer of a metal layer from an embossing tool to a film. Since Sumi's laminate layers 10 and 20 are part of the finished laminate board, Sumi cannot properly be said to transfer a metal layer from the laminate layers 10 and 20 to the pre-preg layer since the laminate layers, metal layer, and pre-preg layer are all incorporated into the same finished product. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 21 is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 22, 23, and 25 depend from Claim 21 and are therefore patentable over Sumi at least by virtue of their dependence from a patentable base claim.

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sumi in view of Chong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,758,413). Claim 24 depends from Claim 21. As indicated above, Sumi does not disclose or suggest all of the features of Claim 21. Chong, cited for its teaching of an additional plated layer, does not cure the deficiencies of Sumi with respect to Claim 21. Therefore, Claim 24 is patentable over Sumi in view of Chong at least by virtue of its dependence from the patentable base claim 21.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of Claims 18 and 21-24. If the Examiner has any questions or other correspondence regarding this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at the below listed telephone number and address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Skrehot", with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Michael K. Skrehot
Reg. No. 36,682

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Phone: 972 917-5653
Fax: 972 917-4418